DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 403 CS 504 281

AUTHOR Kneupper, Charles W.; Williams, M. Lee
TITLE Assessing Outcomes in Variations of the Basic Course: A Comparative Analysis of Student Perceptions.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (Ocean City, MD, April 27-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Development; Communication Research; *Course Evaluation; Higher Education; Learning Processes; *Public Speaking; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Skill Development; *Speech Communication; Speech Instruction; Surveys; Units of Study; Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

As a preliminary study evaluating the relative merits of skill development and information exposure in speech communication classes, an opinion survey was administered to students taking two variants of the introductory course. The two courses, labeled "Basic Blend" and "Blend: Public Speaking Emphasis," included roughly equivalent units on communication theory, interpersonal communication, and small group communication; but the public speaking emphasis course worked two additional weeks on public speaking. Survey results indicated significantly greater student satisfaction with the overall instruction and the total knowledge and ability acquired in the public speaking emphasis course. Students in this course also reported greater self-perception of improvement in the public speaking unit and in writing skills associated with this unit--the ability to outline, to develop and support a thesis, and to conduct research. Time spent on a unit, by itself, did not appear to be a critical factor in determining student self-perception of improvement. (The survey instrument is appended.) (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED233403

ASSESSING OUTCOMES IN VARIATIONS OF THE BASIC COURSE:

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles W. Kneupper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Charles W. Kneupper
Associate Professor of Speech Communication
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666

and

M. Lee Williams
Associate Professor of Speech Communication
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666

Paper presented to the 1983 Eastern Communication Association Convention, Ocean City, Maryland.

CS 504281

ASSESSING OUTCOMES IN VARIATIONS OF THE BASIC COURSE:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

Basic courses in Speech Communication exist in indefinite variety. Basic courses can be structured according to different "philosophies" or may reflect "expedient compromises" among competing interests within departments. The philosophic alternatives might be characterized on a continuum which emphasizes performance/skill development at one extreme and information exposure/cognitive comprehension on the other. In addition to these "philosophic" differences, basic courses also vary in terms of the content units included. Possible units include Communication Theory, Interpersonal Communication, Small Group Communication, Organizational Communication, Public Speaking, Mass Communication, etc.[1] Courses vary in terms of the units selected for inclusion, the time allocated to the various units, and these differences interact with varying degrees of emphasis on performance/skill development and information exposure/cognitive comprehension. Given this variety in basic courses, it would be difficult to empirically assess the impact of the multitude of differences. Not only is the empirical research faced with the problems of scope and the standard relative inability to control variables in the educational setting, but there is no overwhelming consensus in the discipline over desired outcomes or where differences may be found over preferred outcomes. How, for instance, does one assess the relative gain in skill development against a relative loss in information exposure or cognitive comprehension?

If one turns to the scholarly literature of the discipline for assistance in answering this sort of a question, then a survey of the

literature since 1970 will reveal no attempts to cope with it and almost no research evaluating the outcomes of basic course instruction. In fact, despite all the philosophical wrangles, there is rather little we know about the outcomes of taking a basic speech communication course.[2] It could be that a blend philosophy might actually enhance skill development more than a philosophy exclusively devoted to performance and skill development. There is a need for assessing the outcomes of variations in basic courses to help answer such questions as: At what point do performances begin to result in diminishing returns in skill development? How do variations in time allocation relate to student comprehension and retention of theoretical information? Do students gain as much from "simulations" as "graded exercises?" Answers to questions of this sort will be useful to individual teachers, and course directors in the design and operation of basic courses. But a better understanding of the outcomes of basic communication instruction could also be useful in defending the basic course in terms of its achievements rather than just its goals.

In order to provide preliminary answers to questions such as these, and as part of an ongoing evaluation of the basic course at _____ _____ University, a survey of student perceptions and opinions was conducted at the end of the Spring 1982 semester in two variations of blend basic courses. This study will be reported in the following fashion:

1. Description of Course Variations
2. Description of Survey and Hypotheses
3. Survey Results and Interpretation
4. Limitations and Need for Further Research

DESCRIPTION OF COURSE VARIATIONS

For ease of reference, one variation will be labeled the BASIC BLEND and the second labeled as BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS. Both variations reflect a common approach to the basic course and included units on COMMUNICATION THEORY, INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION, SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION, AND PUBLIC SPEAKING. Both courses were taught by faculty members who lectured over content material and supervised graduate teaching assistants who worked in classes with between 25 and 30 students. A common textbook was used in both variations. Figure 1 clarifies the differences in the course, showing the time allocation between units and the sequencing of units.

FIGURE 1

COMPARISON OF COURSE VARIATIONS

COURSE UNIT TIME ALLOCATION	BASIC BLEND	BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS
COMMUNICATION THEORY	3 1/3 weeks	2 weeks
INTERPERSONAL COMM.	2 weeks	2 weeks
SMALL GROUP COMM.	2 2/3 weeks	2 weeks
PUBLIC SPEAKING	5 weeks	7 weeks
EXAMS	1 week	1 week

UNIT SEQUENCE	BASIC BLEND	BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS
	COMMUNICATION THEORY	COMMUNICATION THEORY
	INTERPERSONAL COMM.	PUBLIC SPEAKING: INFORMATIVE
	SMALL GROUP COMM.	SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION
	PUBLIC SPEAKING	PUBLIC SPEAKING: PERSUASIVE
		INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION

GRADED PERFORMANCES	BASIC BLEND	BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS
	Problem-solving discussion	Problem-solving discussion
	Discussion outline	Discussion outline
	Two speeches	Three speeches
		Three speech outlines

The BASIC BLEND allocated more time to the Communication Theory and Small Group Communication units of the course and less time to Public Speak-

ing. Although the time differential was only two weeks in percentage terms, the BASIC BLEND spent 66% more time on Communication Theory, 33% more time on Small Group Communication, and 40% less time on Public Speaking than the BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS. In sequencing the BASIC BLEND followed a standard sequence from COMMUNICATION THEORY through the levels of communication: INTERPERSONAL, SMALL GROUP, AND PUBLIC. In contrast, the BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS began with COMMUNICATION THEORY, moved to PUBLIC SPEAKING, sandwiched GROUP COMMUNICATION between sub-units on PUBLIC SPEAKING (both for variety and under a problem solving theme which unified both units), and ended with INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION. In regard to assignments, the key difference was the additional speech and graded outlines in the BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS.

DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY AND HYPOTHESES

A thirty-two item instrument was developed to measure student self-perceptions concerning their improvement in cognitive comprehension and skill development as a result of taking a basic speech communication course. (A copy of the survey is attached as Appendix I.) The survey was circulated among departmental faculty and particularly between the two lecturers for phrasing and preliminary consensus on inclusion of items generally considered among the goals of introductory courses in speech communication.

The survey included five demographic items providing classification, sex, expected grade, grade point average, and instructor. One item dealt with overall satisfaction with instruction, and one item with overall student satisfaction with knowledge and ability developed in the course. Twenty items were devoted to assessing student self-perceptions of improvement in "understanding" or "ability" in various units of the course. Of

these twenty items, three items concerned Communication Theory; four items concerned Interpersonal Communication; two items concerned group communication; nine items concerned Public Speaking, and two items with the transference of composition skills to writing. Finally, five items of student opinion were included as assessments of their perceptions of their own needs, interests and general improvement.

Because the survey was based on student self-perceptions of improvement, there seemed no reason to assume that students in variations of the basic course would perceive themselves as more improved simply by virtue of the course section they enrolled in. Students were reporting perceptions of self-improvement, not comparing themselves to students in other variations. Thus, the initial hypothesis was that there would be no significant differences in perceived improvement between the BASIC BLEND and the BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS.

SURVEY RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

The survey was administered during the last day of the 1982 Spring semester prior to the final examination period. The survey was given to 101 students from the PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS and 132 student from the BASIC BLEND. Students were not randomly selected. All students attending the last class period were given the survey to complete.

The survey results concerning student self-perception of improvement and ability in the units of the course are reported in Tables 1 through 3. Table 1 provides an item by item listing of results including mean scores, t value, p value and variance accounted for. Table 2 provides a unit by unit comparison in which all items relating to a given course unit are pooled in the comparison. Mean scores, t value, p value, and variance accounted for are provided. Finally, Table 3 provides a rank ordering of the items noting differences judged to be "meaningful."

In interpreting the results of the survey an important statistical caution is important. Because there were a large number of students in the study, statistical power was very high. When statistical power is very high, the probability of discovering "statistically significant difference" is great but the meaningfulness of the difference in practical terms can be minimal. Therefore, discovering a statistically significant difference was considered a necessary but insufficient criteria for any survey results to be considered meaningful. In order to be considered meaningful, an eta^2 (variance accounted for) value of 5% (.05) was set as criterion. Although this is an arbitrary standard, it assures that results considered meaningful are not merely artifacts of statistical power.

TABLE 1

Survey Results for Items 7-26

ITEM # AND ISSUE	MEAN PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS	MEAN BASIC BLEND	t	p	eta^2
7. Improved understanding of communication process.	3.84	3.54	2.95	.004	.036
8. Improved understanding of communication breakdown.	3.83	3.78	.50	.617	.001
9. Improved understanding language influence on thought, perception	3.70	3.57	1.18	.241	.006
10. Improved understanding small group decision making process.	3.68	3.67	.15	.884	.0001
11. Improved understanding communication effects interpersonal relationships	3.81	3.60	1.84	.067	.014
12. Improved ability to participate in small group discussion.	3.64	3.54	.91	.363	.0004
13. Improved ability as listener.	3.62	3.32	2.61	.01	.029
14. Improved ability to use feedback.	3.58	3.50	.77	.44	.003

TABLE 1

Cont'd.

ITEM # AND ISSUE	MEAN PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS	MEAN BASIC BLEND	t	p	eta^2
15. Improved ability in interpersonal comm.	3.69	3.41	2.56	.011	.028
16. Improved understanding purposes, types of, parts of public speech	3.82	3.74	.73	.469	.002
17. Improved ability to organize a speech.	4.11	3.82	2.55	.012	.027
18. Improved ability to research a speech.	3.76	3.39	2.99	.003	.037
19. Improved ability to logically outline.	3.93	3.26	5.37	.0001	.111
20. Improved ability to effectively deliver a speech.	3.95	3.61	3.16	.002	.041
21. Reduced fear of public speaking.	3.69	3.25	3.23	.001	.043
22. Improved ability to invent/generate ideas	3.41	3.22	1.68	.093	.012
23. Improved ability to analyze and explain causes.	3.45	3.06	3.40	.001	.048
24. Improved ability to develop and support a thesis.	3.63	3.12	4.42	.0001	.078
25. Used knowledge of speech composition to improve writing.	3.52	3.00	4.11	.0001	.068
26. Improved writing ability because of research, organization, and analytic skills taught in speech communication.	3.51	2.80	5.62	.0001	.120

TABLE 2
RESULTS FOR CLUSTERED ITEMS
RANKED ACCORDING TO VARIANCE ACCOUNTED FOR

CLUSTER ISSUE	MEAN PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS	MEAN BASIC BLEND	t	p	eta^2
WRITING (Items 25, 26)	3.52	2.90	5.33	.0001	.109
PUBLIC SPEAKING (Items 16-24)	3.75	3.39	4.38	.0001	.077
ALL ITEMS (Items 7-26)	3.71	3.41	3.99	.0001	.064
INTERPERSONAL (Items 11, 13-15)	3.68	3.46	2.42	.02	.025
COMMUNICATION THEORY (Items 7-9)	3.79	3.63	1.80	.07	.014
SMALL GROUPS (Items 10, 12)	3.66	3.60	0.61	.54	.002

TABLE 3
MEANINGFUL RESULTS
RANKED ACCORDING TO VARIANCE ACCOUNTED FOR

ITEM # AND ISSUE	MEAN PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS	BLEND	t	p	eta^2
26. Improved writing ability because of research, organization, and analytic skills taught in speech comm.	3.51	2.80	5.62	.0001	.120
19. Improved ability to logically outline.	3.93	3.26	5.37	.0001	.111
24. Improved ability to develop and support thesis.	3.63	3.12	4.42	.0001	.078
25. Used knowledge of speech composition to improve writing.	3.52	3.00	4.11	.0001	.068

Comparison of the mean scores in Table 1 reveals that the BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS ranks higher on all items than the BASIC BLEND. Examination of Table 2 shows that when pooled by course unit and overall, there are statistically significant differences between the courses overall, and in the units on interpersonal communication and public speaking. However, the variance accounted for in Interpersonal Communication is only 2.5% and thus is not considered meaningful. The only differences which meet both the criteria of statistical significance and over 5% of the variance accounted for are the public speaking units and comparisons between the two courses overall. The difference in the cluster concerning skill transference to writing may be viewed as a probable concomitant outcome of the differences in the public speaking units. In terms of variance accounted for this seems to signal the strongest difference between the two courses. Examination of Table 3 shows that only four of the twenty items of the survey meet the criteria for being considered meaningful. These items which suggest that students in the PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS perceive themselves to be more improved in their abiltiy to logically outline, develop and support a thesis, and to use and improve their writing skills as a result of the research, analytical and organizational skills learning is speech communication, all seem most related to the effects of the public speaking unit. Further, three other items from the public communication cluster approach the criteria for meaningfulness accounting for over 4% of the variance. These items were increased ability to analyze causes, reduced fear of public speaking, and improved effectiveness in delivery (see items 20, 21, 23 in Table 1).

When measured against the criteria of student perceptions of improvement, it seems clear that the BASIC BLEND and PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS

produce approximately equivalent results on the units of COMMUNICATION THEORY, INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION, and SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION. However, the PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS does seem to result in greater self-perception of improvement in public speaking than the BASIC BLEND. Time alone spent on the unit does not seem to be the critical factor, for if greater time spent on a unit results in greater student self-perception of improvement, then the BASIC BLEND ought to result in greater self-perceptions of improvement on COMMUNICATION THEORY and SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATION units. Yet, this result did not occur. Perhaps, it is the concentration of more time on a single unit or the cumulative impact of additional public speaking theory and experience which results in improved understanding and ability in the public speaking unit. Perhaps the additional practice on one additional speech performance allows a greater sense of maturation/improvement.

LIMITATIONS AND NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Like much educational research, it was not possible to conduct the survey with the rigor of a laboratory experiment. Students were not randomly assigned to course variations. The classes met at different times of the day. As an attempt to consider some of the possible alternative explanations to the results, a number of items were included in the survey. Table 4 provides a demographic comparison of the two course variations. Table 5 provides student opinions of areas of the courses. Table 6 provides student satisfaction with instruction and overall achievement in the course.

TABLE 4
DEMOGRAPHIC COMPARISONS

CLASSIFICATION	PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS Frequency	PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS Percentage	BASIC BLEND Frequency	BASIC BLEND Percentage
Freshman	64	63.4	68	51.5
Sophomore	18	17.8	40	30.3
Junior	12	11.9	17	12.9
Senior	7	6.9	6	4.5
OTHER	0	0	1	0.8
TOTAL	101	100%	132	100%
SEX				
Male	41	40.6	45	34.0
Female	58	57.4	86	65.2
No Response	2	2.0	1	0.8
TOTAL	101	100%	132	100%
EXPECTED GRADE				
A	8	7.9	20	15.2
B	81	80.2	69	52.3
C	12	11.9	40	30.3
D	0	0	2	1.5
F	0	0	1	0.8
GRADE POINT AVERAGE				
3.5 - 4.0	4	4.0	11	8.3
3.0 - 3.4	28	27.7	30	22.7
2.5 - 2.9	40	39.6	46	34.8
2.0 - 2.4	27	26.7	42	31.8
below 2.0	2	2.0	3	2.3

TABLE 5
STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF AREAS OF THE COURSE

ITEM	AREA OF COURSE	BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS Frequency	BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS Percentage	BASIC BLEND Frequency	BASIC BLEND Percentage
I27 - the most interesting unit of this course was:	a. comm. process	11	10.9	15	11.4
	b. interper. comm.	45	44.5	36	27.2
	c. small group comm.	20	19.8	34	25.8
	d. public speaking	24	23.8	45	34.1
	OTHER	1	1.0	2	1.5
		101	100%	132	100%
I28 - the most important unit of this course should be:	a. comm. process	23	22.8	23	17.4
	b. interper. comm.	27	26.7	23	17.4
	c. small group comm.	17	16.8	15	11.4
	d. public speaking	33	32.7	69	52.3
	OTHER	1	1.0	2	1.5
		101	100%	132	100%

TABLE 5
Cont'd.

ITEM	AREA OF COURSE	BLEND: PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS		BASIC BLEND	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
I29 - the area of comm. I most needed improvement in when the course began was:	a. interper. comm.	10	9.9	12	9.1
	b. small group comm.	15	14.9	21	15.9
	c. public speaking	73	72.2	91	68.9
	OTHER	3	3.0	8	6.1
		101	100%	132	100%
I30 - I have most improved my comm. skills in:	a. interper. comm.	20	19.8	21	15.9
	b. small group comm.	16	15.8	41	31.1
	c. public speaking	63	62.4	65	49.2
	OTHER	2	2.0	5	3.8
		101	100%	132	100%
I31 - the area of the course which will be most useful as part of my general a ademic preparation is:	a. interper. comm.	19	18.8	29	22.0
	b. small group comm.	18	17.8	29	22.0
	c. public speaking	61	60.4	69	52.2
	OTHER	3	3.0	5	3.8
		101	100%	132	100%

TABLE 6
SATISFACTION WITH INSTRUCTION AND ACHIEVEMENT

	ITEM # AND ISSUE	MEAN PUBLIC SPEAKING EMPHASIS	MEAN BASIC BLEND	t	p	eta^2
6.	Satisfaction with instruction.	4.29	4.05	2.23	.02	.021
32.	Satisfaction with knowledge and ability developed in the course.	4.28	3.94	3.09	.002	.04

In regard to the demographic comparisons presented in Table 4, some noticeable differences were revealed. First, although the proportion of juniors and seniors was approximately equal between the two variations in the basic course, there were proportionately more freshman in the public speaking emphasis and more sophomores in the basic blend. Second, there was a greater proportion of females to males in the basic blend than the public speaking emphasis. In the basic blend the ratio was approximately 2 to 1, and in the public speaking the ratio was 3 to 2. Third, grade expectations were slightly lower in the A category in the public speaking emphasis, but much higher in the B category. In fact, combining the A and B levels, approximately 88% of the public speaking emphasis students expected higher level grades compared to 68% of the basic blend students. This result is only slightly moderated by the fact that students in the public speaking emphasis reported a slightly higher GPA. Since it is plausible that higher grade expectations influences students' "sense of improvement," this is an important alternative explanation which cannot be discounted.

Table 5 reveals striking similarities between the students in both variations and some apparent paradoxes. For example, students in both course variations ranked the areas of communication in which they most needed improvement at the beginning of the course as 1) public speaking (approximately 70% of all students), followed by 2) small group communication, and 3) interpersonal communication. Also, students in both variations reported that public speaking was the area in which they had most improved their communication skills. Finally, students in both variations reported that they felt that public speaking was the area of the course "most useful as part of my general academic preparation."

Paradoxically, public speaking was considered the most interesting unit of the course in the basic blend, while interpersonal communication was considered the most interesting unit in the public speaking emphasis. Similarly, although students in both variations judged that public speaking should be the most important unit in the course, this was a clear majority opinion in the Basic Blend while only a plurality opinion (32.7%) in the Public Speaking Emphasis. The degree of consensus between students in the two variations suggests considerable similarity despite the demographic differences. The apparent paradoxes are most plausibly explained as a function of the sequencing of units. For example, that students in the public speaking emphasis regarded interpersonal communication as most interesting was probably in part due to its being the last unit in that course variation. Similarly, public speaking was the last unit in the Basic Blend. A similar recency effect may have also influenced student opinion of the relative importance of various course units.

Table 6 reveals potential alternative explanations of the survey results of considerable importance. Student satisfaction with instruction differed in the two course variations. However, the difference, although statistically significant, did not reach the criteria for meaningful in terms of variance accounted for. Overall, students in both course variations could be described as moderately satisfied. Similarly, overall student satisfaction with knowledge and ability developed in the course also differed and approached the criteria for meaningfulness in that it accounted for 4% of the variance. This difference may well be a function of the treatment differences. If students are more satisfied with the knowledge and ability they have developed, it follows that they would have greater perceptions of self improvement and probably higher satis-

faction with instruction. However, the causal sequences may be more complex, and this can easilty be seen as a "which cam first, the chicken or the egg" sort of problem, which additional research will need to resolve.

Several other limitations of the study require mention. First, in several cases the scaling instrument required forced choice ordering which led to rankings between areas of the courses. In addition to these items, items which allow comparisons of perceived degree of improvement on various course unit would be desirable. This would allow more precise comparisons between the course variations. Also, the difference in regard to transference of speech composition skills to writing may be a function of the interaction between assignment differences and explicitness of the relation presented by lecturers. Students in the public speaking emphasis did more outlines and were graded and criticized on their outlines, plus the lecturer in the public speaking emphasis reported on several occasions drawing explicit connections between composition theory for speeches or writings, while the basic blend lecturer did not report making such explicit connections.

CONCLUSIONS

Although there are limitations of design and plausible interpretations as alternatives to the attribution of differences to the course variations, we view the course variations as the strongest and most meaningful explanation of the survey results. However, before definite conclusions can be reached additional research will be required. In the Fall of 1982, a survey will be conducted in which a single lecturer teaching both variations (with an identical staff of teaching associates) can control for instructor differences. Further, refinement in the measurement instrument will allow for some more precise comparisons between course variations. It is important for speech communication to assess the outcomes of communication instruction in order to improve and justify that instruction. This study is a beginning in that direction.

END-NOTES

[1]James W. Gibson, Charles R. Gruner, Michael S. Hanna, Mary Jeannette Smythe, and Michael T. Hayes. "The Basic Course in Speech at U. S. Colleges and Universities: III," Communication Education. 29 (1980), 1-9.

[2]A survey of the literature since 1970 reveals only one study assessing outcomes in the manner suggested here. See Don F. Faules, Steve Littlejohn, and Joe Ayres. "An Experimental Study of the Comparative Effects of Three Instructional Methods on Speaking Effectiveness." Communication Education. 21 (1972), 46-52. The key results of the study are that instruction in theory does not result in improved practice in regard to public speaking.

1310 STUDENT SURVEY

This survey is part of the department of Speech Communication's efforts to evaluate the effectiveness and to improve the effectiveness of this course. The results of this survey will be used in the deliberations of the department on changes in the course. The results will not be used for purposes of instructor evaluation.

On your scantron form please mark the appropriate letter for the answer to the survey questions.

1. Classification:
   a. Freshman b. Sophomore c. Junior d. Senior e. Other

2. Sex: a. Male b. Female

3. Expected Grade: a. A b. B c. C d. D e. F

4. Grade Point Average: a. 3.5-4.0 b. 3.0-3.4 c. 2.5-2.9 d. 2.0-2.4
   e. below 2.0

5. Lecturer: a. b.

6. Overall Satisfaction with Instruction (Lecturer and Small Group Instructor):
   a. very satisfied b. moderately satisfied c. slightly satisfied
   d. unsatisfied e. very dissatisfied

Comparing your knowledge and skill in communication prior to taking this course, please respond to the following statements:

7. I have improved my understanding of the communication process:
   a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

8. I have improved my understanding of ways that communication can break down
   a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

9. I have improved my understanding of how language influences thought and perception.
   a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

10. I have improved my understanding of small group decision making processes
    a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

11. I have improved my understanding of how communication effects my interpersonal relationships
    a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

12. I have improved my ability to effectively participate in small group discussion
    a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

13. I have improved my ability as a listener
    a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

14. I have improved my ability to use feedback
    a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

15. I have improved my ability in interpersonal communication
    a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

16. I have improved my understanding of the purposes, types of, and parts of a public speech
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

17. I have improved my ability to organize a speech
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

18. I have improved my ability to research a speech
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

19. I have improved my ability to write a logical outline.
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

20. I have improved my ability to effectively deliver a speech
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

21. I have reduced my fear of speaking in public
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

22. I have improved my ability to invent/generate ideas
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

23. I have improved my ability to analyze and explain causes
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

24. I have improved my ability to develop and support a thesis
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

25. I have used my knowledge of speech composition to help my writing
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

26. I have improved my writing ability because of the research, organization, and analytic skills taught in speech communication.
a. greatly b. a good deal c. moderately d. slightly e. not at all

27. In my opinion, the most interesting unit of this course was:
a. communication processes b. interpersonal communication c. small group communication d. public speaking

28. In my opinion, the most important unit of this course <u>should be</u>:
a. communication processes b. interpersonal communication c. small group communication d. public speaking

29. In my opinion, the area of communication I most needed improvement in when the course began was:
a. interpersonal communication b. small group communication
c. public speaking

30. In my opinion, I have most improved my communication skills in:
a. interpersonal communication b. small group communication c. public speaking

31. In my opinion, the area of the course which will be most useful as part of my general academic preparation is: a. interpersonal communication
b. small group communication c. public speaking

32. Overall, considering the knowledge of communication and the skills I have developed in this course, I am: a. very satisfied b. moderately satisfied c. slightly satisfied d. unsatisified e. very dissatisfied